



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45268

SOURCE SELECTION DETERMINATION

**TECHNICAL SUPPORT FOR HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT
FOR THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (ORD) RFP 68HEOC18R0011**

1.0 DETERMINATION/SELECTION

In accordance with FAR 52.215-1, I have determined that award of the contract resulting from Solicitation RFP 68HEOC18R0011 will be made without discussions, to ICF, Incorporated, LLC. This determination is based upon application of the stated evaluation criteria and the evaluation approach for RFP 68HEOC18R0011, i.e., where all evaluation factors other than cost or price when combined are significantly more important than cost or price, and the utilization of a "best value" analysis. The findings below support this determination, which is in the best interest of the Government.

2.0 BACKGROUND

The EPA's Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) program is designed to provide robust and responsive risk assessment support to risk management decisions aimed at protecting human health and the environment. The HHRA program is the world leader in providing both an essential portfolio of risk assessment products and in undertaking targeted and innovative methods development to advance risk analysis. The National Center for Environmental Assessment (NCEA) within the Office of Research and Development (ORD) is responsible for key products under this national program.

This contract shall provide ORD with support for (1) conducting risk assessments on environmental stressors (i.e., physical, chemical, microbial, or other agent forms), and (2) developing state-of-the-art methods, models, and guidance documents for human health and environmental risk assessment.

The Government anticipates award of an indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity (ID/IQ) contract that will allow for the issuance of firm fixed price (FFP) and time and material (T&M) type task orders over an ordering period of 5 years. The EPA intends to award a single contract with an ordering ceiling of \$40.3 million.

A. Competition

1. This procurement was reviewed by the Small Business Program Manager who concurred with the Contracting Officer's recommendation to solicit this requirement as a full and open competition.

2. Diligent efforts were made to avoid restrictive criteria in the Solicitation (SOL). No firms indicated that the SOL was unduly restrictive.

Source Selection Information-See FAR 2.101 and 3.104

3. A Pre-Solicitation notice was posted to the Federal Business Opportunities (FBO) website on July 20, 2018. The SOL was made available to potential offerors on FBO and through downloading from FedConnect on August 29, 2018 and amended on September 12, 2018; to update the proposal due date from September 28, 2018 to October 5, 2018.

B. Request for Proposal

One proposal was received by the October 5, 2018 closing date. The proposal received was from ICF Incorporated, LLC (ICF). There were no late proposals. The proposals were submitted for technical evaluation on October 12, 2018. I attended the technical evaluation panel (TEP) consensus meeting held on November 6, 2018, to provide administrative guidance and assistance, and to be present for the proposal evaluation discussions conducted by the TEP. The purpose of administrative participation was not to influence the outcome of the TEP deliberations, but to ensure all points made by the TEP were appropriately encompassed by the established evaluation criteria(s). The final TEP report was accepted on Feb 20, 2019. The technical evaluation report is filed under Tab 53 of the hard contract file.

3.0 Evaluation Methods

Proposal evaluation was consistent with the EPA Source Selection Guide (Appendix A and B to EPAAG 15.3.1) as set out in the SOL.

Offerors were informed that all evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price; see provision M-4 of RFP 68HE0C18R0011 (EVALUATION FACTORS FOR CONTRACT AWARD). The proposals were evaluated in accordance with the technical evaluation criteria set forth in Attachment 6, to the Solicitation. Please find the evaluation criteria, listed in descending order of importance, below:

I. Demonstrated Qualifications of Personnel - Demonstrated qualifications (experience, expertise, education) of Professional Level 3 and 4 personnel relative to the requirements outlined in the Performance Work Statement (PWS) of this solicitation, as measured by the following sub-criteria:

- (1)** Demonstrated qualifications of the proposed Key Personnel Program Manager position in managing contracts of similar size (dollar value) and management scope (including management of subcontractor effort, multiple activities, and changing priorities) to that specified in PWS.
- (2)** Demonstrated technical qualifications of all other Professional Level 3 and 4 personnel in the disciplines relative to the scientific and technical requirements presented in this solicitation. This includes demonstrated experience in the fields of human health risk assessment, toxicology, epidemiology, statistics, and quantitative dose-response modeling, and scientific achievements of the areas of the PWS, as evidenced by publications in the scientific and related literature or other reports available to the public.

II. Project Management Plan - Quality of the proposed project management plan specifically tailored to the activities which will be conducted under any resulting contract, as measured by the following sub-criteria:

Source Selection Information-See FAR 2.101 and 3.104

- A. Demonstrated adequacy and effectiveness of the system proposed to track and monitor individual task orders to ensure performance within the established budgetary constraints and scheduled deadlines. Demonstrated understanding of the problems associated with performance under a contract of this type (multiple, ongoing projects with changing priorities).
- B. Demonstrated effectiveness of proposed plan for managing task orders, including the strategy for managing orders with “quick turn-around rapid response” deadlines and providing for smooth, efficient coordination of efforts, and expected responsibilities of all prime contractor and any subcontractor and consultant personnel on individual task order teams, including the Offerors plan to fulfill the requirements of the RFP PWS. Adequacy of communication and control mechanisms to ensure effective coordination and timely management of activities to be conducted under the contract.
- C. Appropriateness of the overall organizational structure which clearly delineates the personnel responsibilities, lines of authority, and proposed staffing levels, including the proposed Project Manager and span of control mechanisms. Demonstrated appropriateness of the plan proposed to recruit, hire, train, and retain qualified personnel for performance under any resulting contract to fulfill the requirements of the PWS, including the plan to train personnel to ensure they remain abreast of their respective scientific fields. Adequacy of plans for assuring availability of key personnel for the duration of the performance period of the contract.

III. Demonstrated Past Performance - Evaluation on demonstrated performance during the last three (3) years on all or not more than five (5) contracts and/or subcontracts which are similar in size, technical scope, and complexity to that which is described in this solicitation.

VI. Quality Management Plan (QMP) -

The Offeror will be evaluated on their Quality Management Plan (QMP) that describes their Quality Assurance (QA) System. With their proposal, the contractor shall submit a Quality Management Plan (QMP) in accordance with EPA QA/R-2 and pursuant to 48 CFR 46 Higher-level contract requirements (see clause E-4 FAR 52.246-11 HIGHER-LEVEL CONTRACT QUALITY REQUIREMENT (DEC 2014) & L-26 Local Clauses EPA-L-46-101 INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PREPARATION OF A QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN). The QMP must be approved by the NCEA Director of Quality Assurance (DQA) or Quality Assurance Manager (QAM) prior to any work beginning under the contract. Documents specifying the requirements and guidance for developing the QMP can be found at EPA’s website for QMPs (<http://www.epa.gov/quality/epa-qar-2-epa-requirements-quality-management-plans>).

(d) The relative importance of the technical criteria are as follows:

- (1) Criterion I* “Demonstrated Qualifications of Personnel” is the technical criterion of highest importance, followed in level of importance by;
- (2) Criterion II* ‘Project Management Plan’ followed in level of importance by;
- (3) Criterion III* ‘Past Performance’ followed in level of importance by;

Source Selection Information-See FAR 2.101 and 3.104

(4) Criterion IV. 'Quality Management Plan (QMP)'

*All Subcriterion are of equal importance.

In accordance with FAR 15.305(a) the EPA used the following adjectival ratings in its evaluation of all technical criteria other than Past Performance:

Combined Technical/Risk Rating	
Rating	Description
Outstanding	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low.
Good	Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses do not outweigh one another or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal	Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not outweighed by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. Proposal is unacceptable for purposes of an award

EPA will use the following adjectival ratings in its evaluation of the past performance criterion:

Performance Confidence Assessment	
Rating	Description
Substantial Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Limited Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.
Unknown Confidence (Neutral)	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.

Source Selection Information-See FAR 2.101 and 3.104

Below provides a table of adjectival rating results:

Criterion	ICF Rating
Criterion 1: Demonstrated Qualifications of Proposed Personnel	(b)(5)
Criterion 1A: Program Management Personnel	
Criterion 1B: Professional Level 3 & 4 Personnel	
Criterion 2: Project Management Plan	
Criterion 2A: Project Management Tracking & Monitoring	
Criterion 2B: Managing Task Orders	
Criterion 2C: Organizational Structure	
Criterion 3: Past Performance (Developed by the Contracting Officer).	
Criterion 4: Quality Management Plan (QMP)	

4.0 TECHNICAL EVALUATION AND RATING ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS

This section provides the individual technical criteria/subcriteria ratings and a broad rating rationale for the offeror. Additional detailed strength/weakness narratives can be found in the technical evaluation report, filed under Tab 53 of the hard copy file. The content in this section reflects my independent judgement as the source selection official and is based on information gathered through proposal analysis. There were no requests for technical discussions or clarification; it was determined that they were not necessary to make this award determination, and to conduct such discussions/clarifications would have added little to no value to the source selection process.

The proposal was evaluated independently and fairly, by the technical evaluation panel. As supported below, a clear decision is apparent through both technical evaluation and price analysis. (b)(5)

(b)(5)

Source Selection Information-See FAR 2.101 and 3.104

2. Project Management Plan

(b)(5)

Source Selection Information-See FAR 2.101 and 3.104

(b)(5)

3. Past Performance –

(b)(5)

4. Quality Management Plan –

(b)(5)

Source Selection Information-See FAR 2.101 and 3.104

(b)(5)

4.5 PRICE REASONABLENESS ANALYSIS

For proposal evaluation purposes, Attachment 7 of RFP 68HE0C18R0011 Cost Proposal Instructions requested that offerors provide a total price for all five years of the ordering period; incorporating ceiling amounts for anticipated other direct costs. The offeror, ICF Incorporated submitted in accordance with the instructions and an analysis has been performed to confirm the calculations. The results can be found via Attachment 1: ICF Incorporated, LLC Cost Proposal.

(b)(5)

- The source selection for this requirement is based on a best value approach where price is a substantial, although not the most important, evaluation factor.
- As explained below, there is no finding that the price of the otherwise successful offeror, ICF, is unreasonable.

- The quote ICF submitted is (b)(5)
(b)(5)

As such and in accordance with FAR 15.403-1(c)(1)(i), FAR 15.403-1(c)(1)(iii), and FAR 15.404-1(b)(i), (ii) and (v), ICF's price is considered to be competitive, fair and reasonable based on a comparative analysis. Based on a thorough analysis of all factors, ICF's price offers the best value to the Government.

Tasks	Government IGCE	ICF
Direct Labor	(b)(5)	(b)(4)
ODCs		
Grand Total		

5.0 SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL AND RATIONALE FOR AWARD

For purposes of proposal evaluation, all evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined are significantly more important than cost or price.

The technical evaluation and price reasonableness analysis support award of the contract to ICF. ICF demonstrated superior technical merit resulting in very high technical ratings under every rated technical criteria/subcriterion.

ICF's price proposal was compared to the IGCE amount of (b)(5) ICF's total price of

(b)(5)

It is the Source Selection Official's determination that ICF offers the best value and award to ICF is in the government's best interest.

6.0 OTHER AREAS

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

7.0. CONCLUSION

A. I am certain the proposal evaluation process was properly handled in compliance with the evaluation criteria. In addition, I am equally confident the proposal review process was conducted thoroughly and completely, with the utmost integrity of the personnel involved, and in complete accord with the non-disclosure agreements signed by these same personnel.

B. I have reviewed the technical evaluation team report, the price analysis report, the contractor's past performance information, and the proposal. My selection determination is based upon a review of the documents, discussions with advisors and technical team personnel, and a comparative assessment of proposals against the RFP evaluation criteria/subcriteria. I highly considered the evaluation reports and the information provided to me from the technical evaluation team; however, the award decision represents my own independent judgment of an assessment of the technical information, the pricing data, and other information brought out in the contractors' proposals.

C. I agree with the overall technical evaluation and ratings provided by the technical evaluation team.

D. The ICF proposal was found to offer superior technical merit at a fair and reasonable price. ICF has been found to be responsible in accordance with the Solicitation. In addition, there are no other known factors which would preclude award to ICF.

E. Based on my authority as the Source Selection Authority, I determine award to ICF for the proposed price of (b)(4) which is fair and reasonable based on adequate price competition and

Source Selection Information-See FAR 2.101 and 3.104

comparison of the proposed price to the IGCE; supplemented by favorable results from thorough proposal analysis, as documented in this decision document. ICF has been determined to offer the best value to the government, with price and technical merit considered.

SOURCE SELECTION DETERMINATION
TECHNICAL SUPPORT FOR HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT
68HEOC18R0011

PREPARED BY: _____
Clare Hingsbergen, Contract Specialist

REVIEWED BY: _____
Kathleen Roe, Branch Chief, CAD/ORD Branch

APPROVED BY: _____
Matthew Gowney, Source Selection Official